

Remarks

Claims 1-2, 7-13, and 18-24 remain pending in this application after entry of this paper. Claims 3-6 and 14-17 have been canceled. Applicant believes that the invention is patentable. Independent claims 1, 11, and 22 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention by reciting that the master list is composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses. Dependent claims 7, 9, 18, and 20 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 11-13, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Zanchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,633,484).

The present invention provides a system and method for managing a plurality of local lists of a single user utilizing a compact user-carried smart card including a microprocessor and a memory storing a master list configured for synchronizing with each local list. Specification, p. 2, ll. 5-8. Claim 1 recites a system for managing a plurality of local lists of a single user. The plurality of local lists is located at a plurality of remote appliances. Each appliance holds a corresponding local list and includes a card reader. The system comprises a compact user-carried smart card including a microprocessor and a memory storing a master list. The master list is composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses. The master list is configured for synchronizing with each local list. The microprocessor is programmed to synchronize the master list with a local list on a remote appliance when the smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader to allow the user to carry the smart card with the master list stored in the smart card memory to various remote appliances, and synchronize the master list with the various local lists of the appliances. Advantageously, the smart card acts as a token for holding the master list for various local lists kept on various devices wherein the master list is composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses.

Specifically, claim 1 recites, in combination with other features, that the system comprises "a compact user-carried smart card including a microprocessor and a memory storing a master list composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses." The smart card is further limited with the recitation of various structures and functions associated with the card.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Zanchi. Zanchi does describe a method and apparatus for personal attribute selection and management using a preference memory. Zanchi also describes a portable donor device 105 such as a smart card. Device 105 stores interface preferences such as, as acknowledged by the Examiner, font, menu order preferences, location of icons, etc. This functionality of Zanchi is further evidenced by Figure 11 which depicts a preference selection matrix indexed by human senses, environment, and application device.

In contrast to the interface preferences of Zanchi, claim 1 specifically recites that the master list is composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses as opposed to merely containing interface preferences as suggested by Zanchi. The Examiner has not pointed out any specific suggestion in Zanchi that the donor device 105 may be used to store personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses as recited by amended claim 1. The Examiner has only noted that Zanchi describes a donor device 105 storing interface preferences (font, menu order preferences, location of icons, etc.).

Accordingly, Zanchi fails to anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Claim 2 is a dependent claim and is believed to be patentable. Claim 11 is an independent claim and is believed to be patentable for reasons given above for claim 1. Claims 12-13 are dependent claims and are believed to be patentable. Claim 22 is an

independent claim and is believed to be patentable for reasons given above for claim 1. Claims 23-24 are dependent claims and are believed to be patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 11, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detlef (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,403) in view of Zanchi. Regarding claims 1 and 11, Detlef fails to overcome the deficiency of Zanchi. Detlef does describe a distributed voice capture and recognition system. However, Detlef fails to suggest modifying Zanchi to incorporate a master list composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses as recited by independent claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 11 are believed to be patentable over Detlef in view of Zanchi. Claims 3-6 and 14-17 have been canceled.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detlef in view of Zanchi and Hamann (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,191). Regarding claims 1 and 11, Hamann fails to overcome the deficiency of the combination of Detlef and Zanchi. That is, there is no suggestion to modify Zanchi to incorporate a master list composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses as recited by claims 1 and 11. Regarding claims 7 and 18, these claims are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 8, 11 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detlef in view of Zanchi and Teicher (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,787). Regarding claims 1 and 11, there is still no suggestion to modify Zanchi to incorporate a master list composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses as recited by claims 1 and 11. Claims 8 and 19 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detlef in view of Zanchi and Taylor (U.S. Patent No. 5,578,808). Regarding claims 1 and 11, there is still no suggestion to modify Zanchi to incorporate a master list composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses. Claims 9 and 20 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10, 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detlef in view of Zanchi and Chen (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,471). Regarding claims 1 and 11, there is still no suggestion to modify Zanchi to incorporate a master list composed of personal data entries including names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses as recited by claims 1 and 11. Claims 10 and 21 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

For reasons given above, claims 1-2, 7-13, and 18-24 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YVONNE NG

By Jeremy J. Curcuri
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 26, 2003

BROOKS & KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351